

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 EVERETT L. McCOY,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-01-1218 DFL GGH P

12 vs.

13 CAL TERHUNE, et al.,

14 Defendant.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On August 16, 2006, the court recommended that defendants' September 7, 2005,
17 summary judgment motion be granted in part and denied in part. The court granted the parties
18 twenty days to file objections.

19 On September 1, 2006, defendants filed a request for a thirty day extension of
20 time to file objections. The grounds for this request are counsel's large and active caseload and
21 the fact that the court recommended that much of defendants' motion be denied.

22 While the court is sympathetic to counsel's caseload, the court finds the request
23 not well supported. The issues in this action have been well briefed. Counsel's large caseload,
24 standing alone, does not justify the request.

25 /////

26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants' September 1, 2006, request for extension of time to file objections is denied;
2. Defendants' objections to the August 16, 2006, findings and recommendations are due on or before September 20, 2006.

DATED: 9/11/06

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

GREGORY G. HOLLOWS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ggh:kj
mc1218.eot(1)